

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 04 2006

U.S. Appln. No. 09/845,382
Reply to Office Action dated August 9, 2006PATENT
450100-03199**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 2-5, 8, 9, 11-14, 17, 18, 20-23, 26, 27, 29-32, and 35-38 are pending in this application. Claims 2, 4, 9, 11, 13, 18, 20, 22, 27, 29, 31, 36, and 38 are independent. Claims 2, 4, 9, 11, 13, 18, 20, 22, 27, 29, 31, and 36 are hereby amended. Claims 5, 14, 23, and 32, which were indicated to be allowable, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. The features have been incorporated into independent claims 2, 4, 9, 11, 13, 18, 20, 22, 27, 29, 31, and 36.

Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

U.S. Appl. No. 09/845,382
Reply to Office Action dated August 9, 2006

PATENT
450100-03199

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, 13, 18, 20, 22, 23, 26, 27, 29, 31, and 35-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,160,553 to Robertson, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,335,746 to Enokida, et al.

Claims 3, 12, 21, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,160,553 to Robertson, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,335,746 to Enokida, et al. and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,761,655 to Hoffman.

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 2, as amended to incorporate allowed claim 5, recites, *inter alia*:

"...wherein a number of plurality of areas is proportional to the size of said non-image data..."(emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Pat. No. 6,160,553 to Robertson, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Robertson") relates to a graphical user interface in which object thumbnails are rendered on a simulated three-dimensional surface which exploits spatial memory and allows more objects to be rendered on a given screen. The objects may be moved, continuously, on the surface with a two-dimensional input device.

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Patent No. 6,335,746 to Enokida, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Enokida") relates to a file system that has a hierarchical tree structure in which directories and files are placed under another directory. The data of one image is assigned to one file and a group of image data is assigned a common directory name.

U.S. Appln. No. 09/845,382
Reply to Office Action dated August 9, 2006

PATENT
450100-03199

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing has been found in Robertson or Enokida, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or suggest the above-identified feature of independent claim 2. Specifically, Applicants submit that Robertson and Enokida fail to disclose or suggest that a number of plurality of areas is proportional to the size of said non-image data, as recited in claim 2.

Therefore, independent claim 2 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to amended independent claim 2, amended independent claims 4, 9, 11, 13, 18, 20, 22, 27, 29, 31, 36, and 38 are patentable.

Claim 38 recites, *inter alia*:

“generating image data that is related to a non-image data by setting a pixel data for the image data based on a content of the non-image data”

Applicants note that the Office Action states that Robertson does not teach the above-identified feature. However, no prior art is cited that does disclose the above feature.

Therefore, Applicants assume that the claim is allowed.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 04 2006

U.S. Appl. No. 09/845,382
Reply to Office Action dated August 9, 2006PATENT
450100-03199**CONCLUSION**

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for the contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLPBy: Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800